

REMARKS

The Office Action of 08/13/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 20, 29 and 30 were rejected as being anticipated by Yamaura. Claims 2-5 and 21-23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Yamaura in view of Heinonen. Claims 6, 7, 10 and 11 were rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Garlepp. Claims 8, 9, 12, and 16-18, 24 and 25 were rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination in view of Keskitalo. Claims 13-15 were rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Cencich. Claims 1, 20, 29 and 30 have been amended to more clearly define over the cited references. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular the claims have been amended to recite in part that the signal processor controls the respective switches of the multiple antennas such that, at a particular instant in time, each of the multiple antennas is configured as either a *transmit-only antenna or a receive-only antenna*.

No such arrangement of features is taught or suggested in Yamaura.

Yamaura is described in the BACKGROUND section of the present application. As noted there, Yamaura uses a number of duplexers for switching an antenna. That is, in Yamaura, no switching is performed to configure an antenna as a transmit antenna or a receive antenna as claimed. Rather, switching is performed to select one antenna or another antenna for use. The selected antenna is used as both a transmit and a receive antenna and is connected to a duplexer in order to separate a transmit signal from a receive signal. The use of duplexers as in Yamaura is disadvantageous.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-23, 29 and 30 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Urc, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 09/27/2007